

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BOGOTA 04373 132221Z

15

ACTION ARA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 AID-05 MMS-01 PM-03 NSC-05 SP-02 SS-15

CIAE-00 INR-07 NSAE-00 DODE-00 EB-07 TRSE-00 SNM-02

DEAE-00 L-02 IO-10 JUSE-00 AGR-05 /075 W

----- 129835

R 131630Z MAY 75

FM AMEMBASSY BOGOTA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8589

C O N F I D E N T I A L BOGOTA 4373

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, CO

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON PRE-IG REVIEW

REF: A) STATE 107524 AND B) STATE 108966

1. EMBASSY COMMENTS ON DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM WILL FOLLOW BY SEPTTEL. THIS CABLE REPRESENTS OUR COMMENTS ON BALANCE OF POINTS COVERED IN REFTTEL.

2. MILITARY ASSISTANCE. I DISAGREE WITH DOD THAT SO-CALLED "OUT YEARS" SHOULD NOT SHOW SPECIFIC FIGURES (P12 CASP). I HAVE ALREADY COMMENTED AND MADE MY RECOMMENDATIONS ON POM (BOGOTA 2592). CASP MERELY REPEATS THESE. THOSE FIGURES THEREFORE REPRESENT THIS MISSIONS POSITION ON THE ENTIRE POM PERIOD AND WILL BE STUDIED, I PRESUME, IN THAT CHANNEL AND CONTEXT. POINT IS THAT OUR POSITION ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE WAS REASONED OUT AS A TOTAL PACKAGE IN BOGOTA 2592; IT IS IMPORTANT, IN MY VIEW, THAT THE IG KNOW, NOT ONLY THAT THERE WILL BE REDUCED LEVELS IN THE OUT YEARS, BUT HOW WE SPECIFICALLY PROPOSE TO PHASE IT DOWN UNDER OUR CONCEPT. I PRESUME DOD OBJECTION IS BECAUSE IT DOES NOT WANT TO COMMIT ITSELF. BUT PUTTING IN PRECISE FIGURES WOULD NOT RPT NOT BE SUCH A COMMITMENT, FIRST BECAUSE CASP COVERS ONLY TWO YEARS, AND SECONDLY, BECAUSE NOTHING IS IRREVERSIBLE IN ANY CASE. INDEED, IF GOC DOES NOT UTILIZE CREDITS, NEXT
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BOGOTA 04373 132221Z

YEARS' CASP (AND POM) MAY BE MARKEDLY DIFFERENT IN ANY CASE

IF DOD OBJECTS TO PRECISE FIGURES, THEY SHOULD "TAKE A DISSENTING FOOTNOTE".

3. AS TO PERSONNEL LEVELS, I WISH TO POINT OUT THAT PROJECTED PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE THROUGH MILGRP/SOUTHCOM CHANNELS AND IN A-34. ALTHOUGH LATTER WAS SUBMITTED PARTICULARLY IN RESPONSE TO THE LAST YEARS' IG REQUEST, IT STANDS ON ITS OWN AS MY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WASHINGTON ACTION. WHETHER THIS IS THROUGH OPRED/MODE, UNDERSECRETARIES COMMITTEE, IG OR ANY OTHER CHANNEL, I LEAVE TO WASHINGTON'S WISDOM. THE POINT AGAIN IS THAT THE CASP ONLY REFLECTS PERSONNEL RESOURCE DECISIONS I HAVE MADE AND THAT ARE BEING PROCESSED THROUGH OTHER CHANNELS. FOR THAT REASON THE FIGURES OUGHT TO APPEAR ON THE CASP.

4. WE HAVE NO RPT NO OBJECTION TO EVENHANDEDNESS AMENDMENT (REFTEL B).

5. NARCOTICS CONTROL. NO OBJECTION TO POINTS A-C PROPOSED BY DEA IF THEY WISH TO INCLUDE STATEMENTS TO THIS EFFECT IN NARRATIVE ON THE PROBLEM. (FOREMAT DOES NOT CALL FOR SPELL OUT OF SPECIFIC COA'S, AND THESE ARE IN ANY CASE SPELLED OUT IN NARCOTICS ACTION PLAN.) RE POINT D, WE BELIEVE IT SHOULD STATE ONLY THAT WE ENCOURAGE GOC TO ESTABLISH EFFECTIVE GROUND RULES FOR COORDINATING COLOMBIAN NARCOTICS EFFORT. WE ARE FLATLY OPPOSED TO TRYING TO DECIDE FOR THE GOC WHAT FORM THEY SHOULD TAKE, E.G. ONE AGENCY OR CENTRAL UNIT, AND WE SHOULD NOT TRY TO SPELL THIS OUT IN CASP. RE POINT E, THERE IS NO OBJECTION TO THE THOUGHT OR THE LANGUAGE ON THE JUDICIARY EXCEPT THAT MODIFYING PHRASES SHOULD BE INCLUDED TO POINT OUT THAT THIS IS A SENSITIVE AREA OF SOVEREIGNTY, AND OUR CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE MUCH OR EVEN DO MUCH ENCOURAGING IN LIMITED. RE EXTRADITION TREATY, WE HAVE GRAVE RESERVATIONS AS TO RENEGOTIATING AT THIS POINT TO SECURE GOC AGREEMENT TO EXTRADITE ITS OWN NATIONALS. THIS PRESENTS LEGAL/CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS TO THE GOC AND THAT WILL HAVE TO BE STUDIED. WE PROPOSE SOMEWHAT BROADER LANGUAGE INDICATING THAT PERFECTING OF EXTRADITION TREATY SHOULD BE STUDIED BY L AND POSSIBLE OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN LIGHT THEREOF.

7. WHATEVER THE ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE USED IN NARCOTICS SECTION, WE BELIEVE IT ESSENTIAL TO RETAIN LANGUAGE IN SECOND PARAGRAPH UNDER CONTROL OF MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE AND GOODS ON P 25 WHICH BEGINS: "WE SHALL HOWEVER HAVE TO CONTINUE SPECIAL SENSITIVITY" AND ENDING "...LIMITATIONS ON US PRESENCE AND VISIBILITY IN THIS AREA".

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 BOGOTA 04373 132221Z

8. OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE OF CASP. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT DOD OBJECTIONS TO USING CASP, AND REALLY THEREFORE THE IG, TO PROJECT AHEAD ON PLANNING LEVELS OR TO DECIDE PERSONNEL LEVELS RAISES SOME FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS REGARDING THE CASP'S CURRENT SIGNIFICANCE. THE ORIGINAL IDEA OF THE CASP WAS PRECISELY TO MAKE BINDING DECISION REGARDING PARAMETERS OF POLICY AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS, AND THAT OTHER CHANNELS AND DEVICES--DAP, MAP, POM, ETC--WERE TO CONFORM TO THE CASP

NOT VICE-VERSA. IT ALSO USED TO BE THAT IRG/IG, AS AN
INTERDEPARTMENTAL GROUP AND PART OF THE NSC SYSTEM, COULD MAKE
DECISION BINDING ON OTHER AGENCIES. IS THAT NOT STILL THE
CASE? CAN THE IG NOT MAKE PERSONNEL STAFFING LEVEL DECISIONS
(IT PRESUMABLY THOUGHT IT COULD WHEN LAST YEAR IT REQUESTED
A STUDY BE SUBMITTED TO IT ON REDUCTIONS)? IN SHORT, I WOULD
LIKE TO PUT THE QUESTION: WHAT IS THE RELATION OF THE CASP
THESE DAYS TO RESOURCE ALLOCATION DECISIONS BEING MADE BY
VARIOUS AGENCIES IN SEPARATE CHANNELS AND ON SEPARATE TIME-
TABLES?
VAKY

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DRUG CONTROL, CASP, MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 MAY 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975BOGOTA04373
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750169-0031
From: BOGOTA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750555/aaaabxit.tel
Line Count: 126
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ARA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 75 STATE 107524, 75 AND STATE 108966
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 05 SEP 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <05 SEP 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <17 NOV 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: COMMENTS ON PRE-IG REVIEW
TAGS: PFOR, SNAR, MASS, CO, US
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006